

REMARKS

The Office Action set forth a restriction requirement. In particular, the Office Action found that applicants' instant application contains the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: Group I, including Figures 1-22; Group II, including Figure 23; and Group III, including Figure 24.

Applicants elect, with traverse, Group I including the species of Figures 1-22 for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-57 read on the species of Figures 1-22. Applicants reserve the right to argue that one or more claims are generic.

Applicants understand that, consistent with an election of species requirement, upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicants will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 C.F.R. § 1.141.

Although Applicants have elected Group I, they submit that the species as defined by the Office as Groups I, II, and III do not substantially differ in field or classification so as to constitute an undue burden for the Examiner to search and examine all 65 pending claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the restriction be withdrawn and all pending claims be examined on the merits.

Applicants respectfully submit that the patent application is in condition for allowance. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Filbin, Reg. No. 51,677
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: March 7, 2006